

TERRY T. JOHNSON, State Bar No. 121569 (tjohnson@wsgr.com)
BORIS FELDMAN, State Bar No. 128838 (boris.feldman@wsgr.com)
BAHRAM SEYEDIN-NOOR, State Bar No. 203224 (bnoor@wsgr.com)
CHERYL W. FOUNG, State Bar No. 108868 (cfoung@wsgr.com)
BRYAN KETROSER, State Bar No 239105 (bketroser@wsgr.com)
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
Telephone: (650) 493-9300
Facsimile: (650) 565-5100

Attorneys for Defendants

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PETER RUDOLPH, individually and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

UT STARCOM, HONG LIANG LU, MICHAEL
SOPHIE, THOMAS TOY, and FRANCIS
BARTON,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: C-07-4578 SI

JOINT STIPULATION AND
[PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING
TIME FOR DEFENDANTS'
RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S CLASS
ACTION COMPLAINT

1 WHEREAS, on September 4, 2007, Plaintiff filed his Class Action Complaint for
2 Violations of the Federal Securities Law ("Class Action Complaint");

3 WHEREAS, on September 20, 2007, lead plaintiffs in the action entitled *In re*
4 *UTStarcom, Inc. Securities Litigation*, No. C-04-4908 (N.D. Cal.) ("*In re UTStarcom*"), filed an
5 Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related Pursuant to Civil Local
6 Rules 3-12 and 7-11 ("Motion to Relate Cases"), requesting that that court relate the instant
7 action to *In re UTStarcom*;

8 WHEREAS Plaintiff in this action timely filed a memorandum of points and authorities
9 opposing this Administrative Motion to Relate Cases on September 25, 2007;

10 WHEREAS, the court in *In re UTStarcom* has not yet ruled on the Motion to Relate
11 Cases;

12 WHEREAS, counsel for plaintiff and defendants have met and conferred and have agreed
13 to a schedule for briefing any motions directed at the Class Action Complaint but desire to avoid
14 unnecessary motion practice until it is determined whether the present action will be
15 consolidated with *In re UTStarcom*;

16 WHEREAS, the parties therefore stipulate that: a) defendants' time to Answer or
17 otherwise respond will be extended until forty-five (45) after Court-appointed lead plaintiff(s) in
18 this action files an Amended Complaint in the instant action, b) if and when defendants serve any
19 motion(s) directed at the court-appointed lead plaintiff's Amended Complaint, the lead plaintiff's
20 opposition brief(s) will be due within forty-five (45) days of the filing of such motion, and that
21 defendants' reply brief(s) will be due within thirty (30) days of any opposition;

22 NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to the parties' stipulation and subject to the Court's
23 approval:

24 (a) Defendants' time to Answer or otherwise respond will be extended until forty-five
25 (45) after Court-appointed lead plaintiff(s) in this action files an Amended Complaint in the
26 instant action;

27 (b) if and when defendants serve any motion(s) directed at the court-appointed lead
28 plaintiff's Amended Complaint, the lead plaintiff's opposition brief(s) will be due within forty-

five (45) days of the filing of such motion, and that defendants' reply brief(s) will be due within thirty (30) days of any opposition;

(c) If defendants file and serve a reply to plaintiff's opposition, they must do so within thirty (30) days of the opposition; and

(d) Should the court in *In re UTStarcom* grant the Motion to Relate Cases, defendants shall not be required to respond to plaintiff's Class Action Complaint, but will comply with the existing deadlines already in place in *In re UTStarcom*.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: October 4, 2007

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
Professional Corporation

By: /s/ BAHRAM SEYEDIN-NOOR
BAHRAM SEYEDIN-NOOR

Attorneys for Defendants

Dated: October 4, 2007

FINKELSTEIN, THOMPSON LLP

By: /s/ DONALD J. ENRIGHT
DONALD J. ENRIGHT

Attorneys for Plaintiff

ORDER

PURSUANT TO THIS STIPULATION, AND GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

The Honorable Susan Illston
United States District Court Judge

1 I, Bryan Ketrosier, am the ECF User whose identification and password are being used to
2 file the Joint Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Regarding Time for Defendants' Response to
3 Plaintiff's Class Action Complaint. I hereby attest that Bahram Seyedin-Noor and Donald J.
4 Enright have concurred in this filing.

5
6 Dated: October 4, 2007

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
Professional Corporation

7
8 By: /s/ BRYAN KETROSER
BRYAN KETROSER

9
10 Attorneys for Defendants
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28